

not take cognisance. I would like to know if there is any other order and I wish the Minister would say it.

Janab J. MOHAMED IMAM.—I wanted to suggest at that time that because the Minister wanted to speak on the merits and wanted to give details by making a statement, it would be desirable to hear what the mover had to say. Since the Minister has already made a statement on that point, perhaps the mover will take the opportunity of confirming it or not.

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—At this stage, I would like to bring to the notice of the House that the matter is *sub judice*. Two cases have been registered by the Police in Crime No. 65 of 52-53, Ramanagaram, which is already in the First Class Magistrate's Court and the hearing is on 26th June 1952, *i.e.*, 515 of 52-53. In respect of the other case referred to in the adjournment motion, that certain things happened on that particular day, I may be permitted to say that a case has been registered in Crime No. 86 of 52 under Section 107 of the Criminal Procedure Code. Preliminary order was passed under Section 112.

Mr. SPEAKER.—What is the date of that order?

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—The preliminary order was passed.....I have not got that particular date. But it is prior to 14th July 1952. Before the tabling of this adjournment motion, the preliminary order was already passed and served on the individuals and the case is pending before the Magistrate.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I have adopted a very unusual procedure while allowing the Hon'ble Member to go into the facts of the case, for the simple reason that this particular adjournment motion has had a special significance as has been explained by the Leader of the House. We have heard the statements made both by the Hon'ble Minister and the Leader of the Opposition and also the mover of the adjournment motion. Without going into this question in greater detail, it is to be said that the matter is not urgent within the meaning of the rules. Further, it is doubtful

whether it is of sufficient public importance as to upset the appointed course of business to-day. In view of the detailed statement made by the Hon'ble Ministers, that is the Home Minister and the Leader of the House, I expect the mover is satisfied. Further, no purpose will be served by a debate. In fact, under the rules, the motion is not admissible. But I permitted the Hon'ble Minister to make a statement to satisfy the mover of the Motion. Under the circumstances, this adjournment motion need not be taken up for discussion.

Sri S. GOPALA GOWDA.—I am not satisfied, Sir.....

Mr. SPEAKER.—The Hon'ble Member is not required to make any statement after the ruling.

The Mysore Town Areas Bill, 1952.

Motion to Consider.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Discussion on the motion to consider the Mysore Town Areas Bill will be resumed.

Sri N. HUTCHAMASTHYGOWDA (Huliyurdurga).—Sir, I move the following amendment:

“That the Mysore Town Areas Bill, 1952, be circulated for eliciting public opinion before the end of September, 1952.”

Mr. SPEAKER.—Amendment moved:

“That the Mysore Town Areas Bill, 1952, be circulated for eliciting public opinion before the end of September, 1952.”

This was the suggestion made yesterday by Sri Pattabhiraman and Sri B. Hutche Gowda. The House, I presume, has no objection to this amendment being passed.

The question is:

“That the Mysore Town Areas Bill, 1952, be circulated for eliciting public opinion before the end of September, 1952.”

The motion was adopted.

2 P.M.

The Mysore Appropriation (No. 2) Bill.

Introduction.

Sri K. HANUMANTHAIYA (Chief Minister).—Sir, I introduce the Mysore Appropriation, (No. 2) Bill, 1952, the same having been published in the *Mysore Gazette* Extraordinary dated 14th July 1952, under Rule 48 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in the Mysore Legislative Assembly. Copies of the Bill have already been distributed to the Members.

Motion to consider.

Sri K. HANUMANTHAIYA.—Sir, I move :

“That the Mysore Appropriation (No. 2), Bill, 1952, be taken into consideration.”

Mr. SPEAKER.—Motion moved :

“That the Mysore Appropriation (No. 2) Bill, 1952, be taken into consideration.”

Shall we prescribe some time-limit because there are some more Bills to be discussed? What time would the Members suggest? I think one hour for this Bill would be very reasonable. It is now 2 P.M. By lunch hour, we will finish the Appropriation Bill.

Janab J. MOHAMED IMAM (Jagalur).—Sir, it is my duty to oppose the Appropriation Bill (No. 2). (Laughter) Hon'ble Members are rather amused at my having opposed this Bill. Government seek to spend Rs. 29,69,85,100.

Mr. SPEAKER.—What time shall I fix so far as the Leader of the Opposition is concerned?

Janab J. MOHAMED IMAM.—I will not take much time. I leave it to the Chair.

This Bill has no bearing on the Budget that has been placed before us. Government want Rs. 29,69,85,100 to be spent during the year 1952-53. They want to appropriate this amount from the Consolidated Fund. Whether the Consolidated Fund can permit of so much amount being drawn, whether the Government are in a position to

find so much is a question which we have to consider. According to the statement furnished in the Appropriation Bill we find that the total expenditure met from revenue, including the charged items comes to Rs. 22,91,95,000 or roughly Rs. 23 crores. This covers the expenditure from the revenue. Let us refer to the Budget. What are the figures given there? The total revenue, i.e., the entire income of the Government for the whole year is Rs. 20 crores and the total expenditure met from the revenue is Rs. 21 crores, whereas the total amount they want for the revenue expenditure is 23 crores. Obviously there is difference between the provision made in the Budget and the amount they want us to vote. According to this what is the deficit? When I spoke on the Budget, I pointed out that the deficit would come to nearly Rs. 5½ crores. I think what I have said is amply confirmed and the figures I gave at that time were modest. According to the law of finance or according to Dalton, whatever amount exceeds the normal revenue has to be taken as the deficit. Our normal income is Rs. 20 crores and normal expenditure is Rs. 22 crores and odd. So the deficit, taking into account the normal expenditure and the normal income, comes to nearly Rs. 3 crores, whereas the deficit shown is Rs. 101 lakhs. So the deficit has increased by 2 crores. Rs. 5,89,99,100 is set apart for capital outlay. The point is where to get this sum. In fact, if we take the whole item of expenditure as against Rs. 20 crores income, it will come to 29 crores. Technically, the deficit is Rs. 9 crores. The normal deficit is Rs. 9 crores and the entire deficit is Rs. 9 crores. Where are we to find this sum? According to the Budget, Government depend upon the loans from the Government of India. The loans if sanctioned by Government of India come to Rs. 350 lakhs Rs. 350 lakhs plus Rs. 3 crores 89 lakhs come to Rs. 6 crores, 89 lakhs. Even then Government have to find additional funds to the extent of nearly Rs. 6 crores. What I submit is this. We cannot rely on Budget figures. They are just to swell the Budget and

to show to the public that Government are taking up capital works and development works, without reckoning the resources. Where are you going to get the funds? I think this procedure must be stopped. After all, when you are trying to draw from the Consolidated Fund, the amount must be available. You do not exceed Rs. 15½ crores and you want Rs. 30 crores. All this is a delusion. It is this system of budgeting that has landed us into this financial trouble. From the beginning I have been saying "Cut your coat according to the cloth." If we had adopted this from the beginning, we would not have been in this position. We have been extravagant from the beginning and now we are in this trouble. This system of showing to the public that we are taking up capital works for which we cannot find funds is a delusion, a deception or misguiding the public. I have to point out to the Hon'ble Finance Minister and to the Government, the imperative need for finding out new resources and cutting down the expenditure. We cannot rely on the Central Government. I must say that half of our miseries are due to financial integration. They have taken away our milch cows as was pointed out by the Hon'ble Chief Minister of Madras and they have left for us barren and sterile ones—*halligoddu*—and we are asked to somehow manage.

Sri L. SIDDAPPA (Channagiri).—Say "dry cows".

Janab J. MOHAMED IMAM.—No chance of those cows conceiving.

Half of our miseries are due to the Central Government. I am bold enough to say that. They have taken away all our important branches, our Railways, our Excise duties, our Income-tax and what not.

Mr. SPEAKER.—There was a question put and answered. The Hon'ble Member need not repeat.

Janab J. MOHAMED IMAM.—..... which perhaps would have brought much more revenue. In return we get a paltry sum of Rs. 3 crores 45 lakhs. (An Hon'ble Member: Paltry sum?) Yes. It is a paltry sum compared to the resources we gave. Railways are worth

20 crores now. Income-tax, with all the rules and rigidity and strictness...

Sri K. HANUMANTHAIYA.—I may point out the rules of debate. This is almost the tenth or the fifteenth time this argument is being advanced. I would ask the Leader of the Opposition and the members of the party whether repetition of arguments of the same type and in the same phraseology would make for good debate. Secondly, if repetitions alone are resorted to, I need not meet their arguments because I have met them and the debate itself will be flattened.

Janab J. MOHAMED IMAM.—A Member of this House has the right to advance his views on financial matters on three occasions.

First, when the Rajpramukh's.....

Mr. SPEAKER.—That is all right; to a considerable extent you can do so.

Sri K. HANUMANTHAIYA.—Rules of debate require that there must be no repetitions.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Repetition on one and the same occasion. But the Member can draw the attention of the Government.

Janab J. MOHAMED IMAM.—I shall never repeat. As I pointed out in my budget speech, it is a very important matter. If the Chief Minister does not want to take advantage of, and if he does not want his hands to be strengthened by, these arguments, I will leave it. But, our hearts are sore. You cannot understand our feelings. The Central Government have clipped all our feathers, clipped our wings and they want us to soar or fly high. So, I said the present financial position is very serious. The normal deficit is 3 crores and if you include the capital works, you will have to find extra funds to the extent of 9 crores. Even if the Government of India gives a loan of 3 crores, still this Government will have to find 6 crores. Where are they going to find this sum? Whatever figures are given here, whatever you have shown to the people through this budget, is nothing but an illusion. I oppose strongly this Appropriation Bill, which has no bearing on the Budget and the actual facts and actual state of affairs.

Sri K. HANUMANTHAIYA.—Now that the Leader of the Opposition has spoken. I presume that he has spoken for the whole Opposition. Therefore, I suggest that there need not be any more speeches on this Bill, but this may be expeditiously passed. I hope, I will not be encroaching on the time of the House. Sir, Janab Imam made a good point, whatever may be the language he used; his intention is that we must urge upon the Government of India to make more grants for our capital works and other purposes. As I have already pointed out once. I am continually in correspondence with the Government of India and particularly, with the Prime Minister. But, Sir, we have to see their point of view also. The Prime Minister has written to me that he has treated all the States in India on an equal footing. He, in the very nature of things, cannot show preference to one State as against another. Their argument is that they have been more considerate to the State of Mysore than to some other States. There may be much substance in it. I wish to state once for all that the Agreement relating to financial integration is in the interest of the State. Under the altered circumstances, under the new Constitution, there is no other go. I categorically state that the previous Ministry which was responsible for arriving at this Agreement has done well. They have argued our case ably. They have secured us an annual contribution of 3½ crores of rupees. That is the point which you should not forget. In fact, if all of us go a step further and say that we should thank them, it is not an exaggeration or an over-statement.

Now Sir, with the strength the Leader of the Opposition and his colleagues have given to my elbow, they may rest assured, I may be able to put up a better fight with the Government of India so far as Mysore State is concerned.

Janab J. MOHAMED IMAM.—But you are afraid. (Laughter.)

Sri K. HANUMANTHAIYA.—Sir, if I am afraid, the Leader of the Opposition has put some fire into me. (Laughter). Therefore, Sir, I assure

the House that we will do everything in our power to persuade the Government of India to meet our needs to the maximum extent possible,

In regard to the several figures that Janab Imam has given, to show that our budget is unsound, they require hardly any answer from me. The House, I presume, has already given its approval to the provisions made in the budget, both on the Revenue side and on the Expenditure side. I need not dilate upon that point.

Regarding the cutting down of expenditure, in pursuance of the suggestion made on the floor of this House, I am taking steps to retrench one more office of the Secretaries to Government. The other day, many Members made a suggestion that the number of top officials should be reduced and I thought it was the duty of this Ministry to implement that suggestion as far as it lay in their hands. In that true spirit of cutting down expenditure from the top, I am taking step to reduce the number of Secretaries to Government by one. I hope, now, the Opposition is fully satisfied and they will vote for our Appropriation Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is :

“That the Mysore Appropriation (No. 2) Bill, 1952, be taken into consideration.”

The motion was adopted.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Clauses 2 and 3. The question is :

“That Clauses 2 and 3 stand part of the Bill.”

The motion was adopted.

Clauses 2 and 3 were added to the Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Schedule. The question is :

“That the Schedule stand part of the Bill.”

The motion was adopted.

The Schedule was added to the Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Clause 1. The question is :

“That Clause 1 stand part of the Bill.”

The motion was adopted.

Clause 1 was added to the Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Title and Preamble.
The question is :

“That the Title and the Preamble stand part of the Bill.”

The motion was adopted.

The Title and the Preamble were added to the Bill.”

Motion to pass.

Sri K. HANUMANTHAIYA.—Sir, I move :

“That the Mysore Appropriation (No. 2) Bill, 1952, be passed.”

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is :
“That the Mysore Appropriation (No. 2) Bill, 1952, be passed.”

The motion was adopted.

The Mysore Legislature Salaries Bill, 1952.

Motion to consider.

Sri A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO
(Minister for Law and Education).—
Sir, I move :

“That the Mysore Legislature Salaries Bill, 1952, as reported by the Select Committee, be taken into consideration.”

Mr. SPEAKER.—Motion moved :

“That the Mysore Legislature Salaries Bill, 1952, as reported by the Select Committee, be taken into consideration.”

The amendments will be taken up when we take up the clauses of the Bill.

The question is :

“That the Mysore Legislature Salaries Bill, 1952, as reported by the Select Committee, be taken into consideration.”

The motion was adopted.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Clause 2.

Sri A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO.—

Sir, I move :

“That for sub-clause (4) of clause 2, the following sub-clause shall be substituted, *viz.* :—

“(4) (i) ‘maintenance’ in relation to a residence includes the provision of electricity and water and the payment of local rates, taxes, sanitary charges and the salaries and allowances of butlers, gardeners and other servants appointed by the Government to be the staff attached to such residence ;

(ii) ‘maintenance’ in relation to a conveyance includes the payment of the salaries and allowances of the chauffeur or other person appointed by Government to be in charge of the conveyance and the expenses necessary for keeping the conveyance in proper working order, other than the expenses in respect of such matters as may be prescribed ;”

The above sub-clauses are substituted for the original.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Amendment moved :

“That for sub-clause (4), the following sub-clauses shall be substituted, *viz.* :—

“(4) (i) ‘maintenance’ in relation to a residence includes the provision of electricity and water and the payment of local rates, taxes, sanitary charges and the salaries and allowances of butlers, gardeners and other servants appointed by the Government to be the staff attached to such residence ;

(ii) ‘maintenance’ in relation to a conveyance includes the payment of the salaries and allowances of the chauffeur or other person appointed by Government to be in charge of the conveyance and the expenses necessary for keeping the conveyance in proper working order, other than the expenses in respect of such matters as may be prescribed ;”